UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/594,127	09/25/2006	Akio Sugihara	Q97391	8975
65565 SUGHRUE-265	7590 07/01/200 5 550		EXAMINER	
2100 PENNSYI	LVANIA AVE. NW		RAHMANI, NILOOFAR	
WASHINGTON, DC 20037-3213			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1625	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/01/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/594,127	SUGIHARA ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	NILOOFAR RAHMANI	1625
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLEWHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DEVELOPMENT OF THE MAILING	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tind will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 S This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ This 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowed closed in accordance with the practice under	is action is non-final. ance except for formal matters, pro	
Disposition of Claims		
4) Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/ Application Papers	awn from consideration. or election requirement.	
9) The specification is objected to by the Examin 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ac Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	cepted or b) objected to by the lead of a cepted or b) for objected to by the lead of a cepted of the drawing of the lead of the drawing of the lead of the drawing of the lead of t	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority document application from the International Bureat * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received. nts have been received in Applicationity documents have been received au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 01/25/2007 and 04/30/2008.	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:	ate

Application/Control Number: 10/594,127 Page 2

Art Unit: 1625

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-12 are currently pending in the instant application.

Priority

2. This application was file on 09/25/2006, which is a 371 of PCT/JP05/05377, filed on 03/24/2005, which claims benefit of 60/556,025, filed on 03/25/2004 and claims benefit of 60/638,388, filed on 12/27/2004.

3. Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1-8, 10-12 are rejected because the term "for use in solid formulation" is vague and indefinite. It could be liquid, solid, gas or even in jelly form. Correction is required.

4. Claims 1-9 are rejected because the term "a range showing no influence on product stability" is vague and indefinite. How much amorphous need to be there to have stability? Does it make it stable or unstable? Correction is required.

5. Claim Rejections - Obvious Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute)

Art Unit: 1625

so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 168 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130 (b).

Effective January 1,1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-12 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over the claims 1-13 of the Umejima et al., US 2008/0103171. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the current invention embraces the invention claimed in the above patent.

Determination of the scope and content of the prior art (MPEP §2141.01)

Umejima et al. of US 2008/0103171 claimed identical compositions in claims 1-13 as the instant claims 1-12.

Ascertainment of the difference between the prior art and the claims (MPEP §2141.02)

The difference between the instant claims and the issued claims is the claims are not word for word identical but the scope of both sets of claims overlaps mostly significantly with each other.

Finding of prima facia obviousness-rational and motivation (MPEP §2142.2143)

The issued claims 1-13 are therefore <u>fully embraced</u> by the instant claims 1-12.

Application/Control Number: 10/594,127 Page 4

Art Unit: 1625

6. Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Slatter et al. US 2004/0138253. Slatter et al. disclosed the instant claimed compositions on page 1, formula (I). On the example 1, page 3, acetone and hexane can be used as solvent. Therefore, the instant claim is anticipated by Slatter et al.

- 7. Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Fraser et al. US 2004/0198822. Fraser et al. disclosed the instant claimed compositions on page21, paragraph [0269]. On the paragraphs [0278], [0297], [0307], [0308], [0309], [0311], [0322], [0344], polyethylene glycol can be used. Therefore, the instant claim is anticipated by Fraser et al.
- **8.** Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Saito et al. US 2005/0181031. Saito et al. disclosed the instant claimed compositions of solifenacin on page 1, paragraph [0008]. On the paragraphs

Application/Control Number: 10/594,127 Page 5

Art Unit: 1625

[0033], [0039], [0040], [0041], [0042], [0043], [0044], [0045], polyethylene glycol can be used. Therefore, the instant claim is anticipated by Saito et al.

- **9.** Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Fraser et al. US 2005/0239890. Fraser et al. disclosed the instant claimed compositions of solifenacin on page 21, paragraph [0268]. On the paragraphs [0277], [0296], [0306], [0307], [0308], [0310], [0321], [0343], polyethylene glycol can be used. Therefore, the instant claim is anticipated by Fraser et al.
- **10.** Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Niloofar Rahmani whose telephone number is 571-272-4329. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30 am to 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Janet Andres, can be reached on 571-272-0867. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/NILOOFAR RAHMANI/

06/26/2008

/D. Margaret Seaman/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1625